REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the May 1, 2008 Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22 and 29-33, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,914,695 issued to Walters, et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0196007 to Baron. The rejection asserts that Walters allegedly teaches each element of the claims except automatically mapping or examining a communication protocol, which is allegedly taught by Baron.

The claims are directed toward mapping a resident program to a peripheral device, either by identifying the peripheral device or if the device cannot be identified, then by determining the communication protocol specified by the peripheral device. Each of the independent claims is amended herein to require if the peripheral device is identified "automatically mapping from the identified peripheral device to a corresponding one of said resident programs" and if the peripheral device is not identified "*determining a communication protocol* of said peripheral device, wherein *the determined communication protocol is used to automatically map* to a corresponding one of said resident programs." Thus, the peripheral device is automatically mapped to a resident program by either the identity of the resident device, or lacking a proper identity, determination of the communication protocol of the resident device.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests determining the communication protocol used by the peripheral device, and then using that determined communication protocol to

9

automatically mapping a corresponding program. The office action admits this is not taught by Walters. Baron does is if the peripheral device is not automatically mapped to a resident program is search the device itself for existence of the program. Nothing in Baron teaches or determining the communication protocol prior to mapping. The amended claims require determining the communication protocol and then using that determined communication protocol to automatically map. Thus, the communication protocol needs to be determined prior to mapping to one of the resident programs. In Baron, the peripheral device is searched for a device driver, which if found is mapped as the resident program. The office action states that because the device driver contains communication connectivity protocol, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the communication protocol needs to be examined in order to function. However, what is claimed is examining the communication protocol, and then using the determined protocol to map to a resident program. Baron does exactly the opposite. In Baron, a program (the device driver) is mapped, and from there, a communication protocol is discovered. Only the present invention teaches determining the communication protocol and mapping a resident program based on the results of that communication protocol.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 29, 33 and 35-36 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29, 33 and 35-36 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 29, 33 and 35-36.

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 29, 33 and 35-36, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32 are likewise in condition for

allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated July 1, 2008   By: /James T. Hagler/
                                            James T. Hagler
                                            Reg. No. 40,631
                                            (858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502